



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,631	10/31/2003	Gary Robinson	AAMTC.0118	3378
22858	7590	06/06/2007		
CARSTENS & CAHOON, LLP P O BOX 802334 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER HASSAN, RASHEDUL	
			ART UNIT 2179	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/06/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/698,631	Applicant(s) ROBINSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Rashedul Hassan	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 13 is recited to be dependent from claim 11. However, claim 13 recites "the item screen", which has no antecedent basis if the claim is considered to be dependent from claim 11. Claim 12 on the other hand recites "an item screen".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 15 is recited to be dependent from cancelled claim 14. The examiner assumes that the applicant intended to make claim 15 to be dependent from claim 10 since the cancelled claim 14 was a duplicate of claim 10.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2179

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (US 2003/0055812 A1), hereinafter Williams, in view of Honjo et al (US 2001/0056378 A1), hereinafter Honjo, and further in view of Bailey et al. (2002/0091690 A1), hereinafter Bailey.

For claims 1 (a system) and 8 (a method), Williams discloses a computer system and corresponding method for identifying a part, the system comprising:

a scalable database ([0023], [0029]) of identification data sets (data sets stored in the tables of Fig.), each data set descriptive of an item (lines 2-5 in [0043]) and comprising data for a plurality of alternate numbering schemes (industry reference number and casting I.D., lines 1-7 in [0061]) geared toward different segments of an industry (different factories of the same part manufacturing industry), a family category (516 in Fig. 5), picture files depicting the item (field "Part Img" of parts table in Fig. 5), and identification criteria (fields in product table) defined from the family category (Fig. 5);

a computer-readable medium (memory 106 in Fig. 1, [0022]);

a processor (104 in Fig. 1, [0022]) in communication with the computer-readable medium and the database; and

computer readable instructions on the computer readable medium for execution by the processor (lines 1-3 in [0025]), the instructions configured to

receive user input from an input device and retrieve at least one data set descriptive of an item from the database based upon input received ([0042]),

present a results screen (relational database parts display window 122 of GUI display 114), the screen including the at least one data set retrieved based upon input received ([0042]).

However, Williams does not explicitly teach each data set comprising data for a plurality of alternate numbering schemes geared toward different stages of product lifecycle. But, Williams teaches that the user can determine, using his invention, any form of factory identification used to identify a part (lines 14-16 in [0061]). This teaching not only further clarifies that Williams teaches alternate numbering schemes geared toward different segments of an industry, but also at least suggests or makes it obvious that any form of or alternate numbering schemes necessitated by different considerations can also be incorporated in his invention if needed. Honjo discloses such an exemplary consideration. He teaches a method and system for managing parts used in fluid machinery, wherein he uses an independent control number (control identifier) for each of the parts used in fluid machinery at the plant considering the need to manage stocked spare parts (that is, during the aftermarket stage of the products lifecycle) ([0054]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Williams with that of Honjo to incorporate into each of the dataset data for a plurality of alternate numbering

schemes geared toward different stages of product lifecycle. The motivation for such modification would have been to allow the user to identify a part using any form of proprietary post-factory identification (such as, user defined control number for independent user stock management, Honjo [0054]) used to identify a part.

Williams also does not teach that the instructions are configured to present an input screen having a plurality of input boxes to a user display screen, including input boxes for input of a number scheme. But Honjo teaches using input boxes for input of a number scheme (102,104,105 in Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious, given the general knowledge in the art at the time of the invention, for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Honjo's teachings with that of Williams to present an input screen having a plurality of input boxes to a user display screen, including input boxes for input of a number scheme. The motivation for combining the teachings would have been for searching a part in the database using a number identifier uniquely predetermined for the part (Honjo, [0008]).

Furthermore, although Williams discloses a family wizard (390 in Fig. 3), neither Williams nor Honjo teaches presenting a criteria screen to the user where the criteria screen provides identification questions that correlate to the identification criteria for the corresponding family. Also, regarding claim 8, neither Williams nor Honjo teaches that the results screen presents an option to proceed to the criteria screen for the family corresponding to the displayed data set. But Bailey discloses a searching technique that teaches presenting a criteria screen (Fig. 8A) to the user where the criteria screen provides identification questions (120) that correlate to the identification criteria for the

corresponding family ([0037], [0084] and [0085]). Bailey further teaches that the results screen (Fig. 9A) includes a selectable option (158, 159 or 52 and 77 in Fig 9A, note: 77 is the keyword dropdown list as shown in Fig. 10) for proceeding to a criteria screen for the family to which the item belongs.

Therefore, it would have been obvious, given the general knowledge in the art at the time of the invention, for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Williams and Honjo's teachings with that of Bailey to arrive at the present invention. The motivation for combining the teachings would have been for reducing or eliminating the guesswork associated with searching by proactively presenting the user with acceptable choices and letting the user select from among those acceptable choices and also to provide more user control over the specificity of the search (Bailey, [0037]).

For claims 2 (a system) and 9 (a method), Williams further teaches that the data sets descriptive of an item further comprise data selected from a list consisting of ownership (in billboard 118), size (part/detail description in Fig. 4), sort code (status in Fig. 5), supplier ([0092]) and product line (618 in Fig 6C) of the item.

For claims 3 (a system) and 11 (a method), Williams further teaches that the data sets descriptive of an item further comprise data for ownership (in billboard 118), size (part/detail description in Fig. 4), sort code (status in Fig. 5), supplier ([0092]) and product line (618 in Fig 6C) of the item.

For claims 4 (a system) and 10 (a method), Bailey further teaches that the criteria screen further includes a plurality of drop down menus (122, 124 and 126 in Fig. 8A), each menu associated with a corresponding identification question.

For claims 5 (a system) and 15 (a method), a user device including the input device and the user display screen is inherently taught by Williams as being necessary requirements for operating the user interface.

For claims 6 (a system) and 12 (a method), Williams further teaches that the instructions are further configured to present an item screen depicting a data set for a single item ([0043]).

For claims 7 (a system) and 13 (a method), Bailey further teaches that the item screen (Fig. 10) includes a selectable option (158, 159 or 52 and 77 in Fig 10) for proceeding to a criteria screen for the family to which the item belongs.

Response to arguments

The examiner acknowledges and appreciates applicant's amendments to the claims filed on 03/12/2007.

Based on applicant's remarks pointing out the term "sort code" in paragraph 0042 of the specification, previous rejections under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph for claims 2, 3, 9 and 11, made in the Office Action of 12/11/2006, are hereby withdrawn.

The examiner also acknowledges that claim 14 has been cancelled by the applicant.

Applicant's arguments presented in the remarks filed on 03/12/2007 have been fully considered but are not persuasive due to the following reasons:

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 and 8 to further recite the limitation:

"each data set descriptive of an item and comprising data for a plurality of alternate numbering schemes geared toward different segments of an industry and stages of product lifecycle".

Applicant argues that Williams teaches using only industry reference number and OEM number, as the numbering scheme and that OEM number is not an equivalent alternative to the industry reference number. The examiner disagrees since Williams teaches an additional numbering scheme, casting number, as an alternate way of identifying the parts as disclosed in paragraph [0061]. Such casting numbers are geared toward different segments of the industry since a different casting number is used for identifying the same part made in different factories, wherein each factory can be considered a different segment of the same part making industry. Williams also teaches that any form of factory identification can be used to identify a part (lines 14-16 in [0061]). Therefore, Williams at least suggests or makes it obvious that any form of or alternate numbering schemes necessitated by different considerations can also be incorporated in his invention if needed. Honjo discloses such an exemplary consideration. He teaches a method and system for managing parts used in fluid machinery, wherein he uses an independent control number (control identifier) for each

Art Unit: 2179

of the parts used in fluid machinery at the plant considering the need to manage stocked spare parts (that is, during the aftermarket stage of the products lifecycle) ([0054]). Even if Honjo teaches using such an independent control number as an optional criteria, his teaching combined with that of Williams still makes it obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that a plurality of alternate numbering schemes geared toward different segments of the industry and stages of product lifecycle can be used to identify a part for traceability (Williams, lines 11-15 in [0060]) or independent user-level stock management purposes ([0054]). Therefore, the examiner maintains the previous rejections of claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) over the prior art of record.

Because claims 2-7, 9-13 and 15 depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively, and because no additional limitations were added to these dependent claims by the applicant besides the new limitation added to independent claims 1 and 8, the examiner maintains the previous rejections under 35 U.S.C 103(a) over the prior art of record for these dependent claims also.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rashedul Hassan whose telephone number is 571-272-9481. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Art Unit: 2179

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



(Rashedul Hassan)



BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER